APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,854	12/29/2003	Russell F. McKnight	P1506US01	2761

24333   7590   01/29/2008
GATEWAY, INC.
ATTN: Patent Attorney
610 GATEWAY DRIVE
MAIL DROP Y-04
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER
ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>17 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: <u>*1-40*</u>.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that "a system and method for retrieving prior versions of an application, database, or other function" using a target GUI as a "front-end for version storing software, such as HPOFS," as disclosed by Hocker, cannot be equated to monitoring usage of resources of an information handling system, as recited in claim 1. Hocker teaches "storing the previous m versions of a file, application, database" so that "the user can review prior versions of that file, application, or database without explicitly having to track those versions" (see Hocker Abstract). This is the same as "monitoring versions of data". Applicant argues that "monitoring versions of data" is not the same as "monitoring the usage of the resources of an information handling system". The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As established above, the "versions of data" taught by Hocker includes "versions of a file, application, database". The "resources of an information handling system" recited by Applicant are also versions of a file, application, or database. In an exemplary embodiment of Applicant's invention, page 8 lines 12-23 of Specification, some examples of "resources of an information handling system" are given. These include "one television show 172, three web pages 170, a word document 176, and an excel document 174". In another exemplary embodiment of Applicant's invention, page 18 lines 1-14 of Specification, the usage of the resources are stored, allowing users to browse "versions of past usage". Therefore, it is shown that the "versions of data" taught by Hocker is both equivalent and also used in the same context as the "usage of resources" recited by Applicant.

Applicant further asserts that representations of "versions" of data are not representations of the "usage" of the resources of the system. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As established above, the "resources" recited by the instant Application includes web pages, documents, and other types of files. Web pages, documents, and other types of files are precisely the type of data that Hocker's invention monitors. Further, storing every version of a file is one way of storing "usage" data. Therefore, examiner submits that monitoring versions of data of the system is the same as monitoring usage of resources of the system.